DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 324 HE 000 091

By- Howes, Raymond F., Ed.
Toward Better Preparation of College and University Administrators.
Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 64
Note- 43p.; Report of the proceedings at a sectional meeting of the 19th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois, April 21, 1964.
Available from- National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($1.00).
EDRS Price MF- $0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors- Academic Achievement, Administration, Background, *Higher Education, *Qualifications, *Selection, Skills, *Training

The increasing attention focused on the problem of preparing university and college administrators prompted the Association for Higher Education to convene a group of 250 educators to consider what guidelines should be adopted. Nine panelists led the discussion on how to meet the need for professional highly skilled administrators. Organized training efforts, which were described, have been weakened to date by the lack of coordination among sponsoring groups, lack of systematic evaluation, and lack of research. Three competencies are required: professional skill, comprehensive understanding, and political insight in the Aristotelian sense. The panel considered basic issues of how to find and train administrators for specific posts and what qualities were most important for leadership in academic administration. Although administration is a demanding academic specialization, the idea of special training for potential college presidents is not universally accepted or put into practice. The topic debated at greatest length was whether administrators need to have a scholarly background. A national conference to develop a program of joint action on the preparation of administrators was recommended. (JS)

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

ED 024324

HE 000 941

TOWARD BETTER PREPARATION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

ADMINISTRATORS

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

A report of the proceedings at a sectional meeting of the Nineteenth National Conference on Higher Education

Sponsored by the Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois, April 21, 1964

Edited by
Raymond F. Howes, Assistant to the Chancellor—Public Affairs, University of California, Riverside

Published by the Association for Higher Education, NEA, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

TOWARD BETTER PREPARATION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office to Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

Copyright 1964
Association for Higher Education of the National Education Association

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 48-1458

Single copy, $1; Quantity orders at the following discounts: 2-9 copies, 10 percent; 10 or more copies, 20 percent. Order and make checks payable to the National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Order Number: 251-08188

FOREWORD

The annual conferences of the Association for Higher Education afford a continuing national forum at which faculty and administrators from many disciplines and varied types of institutions from every state convene to analyze and to seek solutions to significant problems.

In 1964, in Chicago, at the nineteenth of these annual conferences, one of the areas of greatest concern and interest was that of the preparation of college and university administrators. Aware of the increasing attention being given to this problem by certain foundations, universities, state educational bodies, accrediting associations, and others, the Association was able to bring together an outstanding panel of educators to consider appropriate guidelines and directions to be taken. Each member of the panel (listed on page VII) was selected because of special contributions already made towards the solution of the problem. The Association was especially pleased that Arthur S. Adams agreed to serve as moderator and that Frederick deW. Bolman was willing to prepare the major presentation, following his two years of concentrated study of the problem.

That the topic and the membership of the panel had high interest was indicated by the fact that approximately 250 administrators and professors from all parts of the nation elected to participate in this "Group 33" at the Chicago conference.

Mr. Adams reports "general agreement" on the part of the participants that a special national conference should be convened to "deal with some of the issues discussed at this meeting . . . to the end that there may be an over-all coordinated effort rather than the separate, sporadic efforts to which people give greatly of their time and energy, not to mention their money, in an endeavor to meet a problem which is deeply sensed but not completely identified."

Because of the widespread interest in this important topic and because the existing source material is as yet rather scarce and scattered, the Association for Higher Education is publishing this report in much more detail than is possible in *Current Issues in Higher Education, 1964,* the report of the proceedings for the entire Nineteenth Conference. The Association for Higher Education acknowledges with warm appreciation

the grant by the Ellis L. Phillips Foundation which has made this publication possible. To Arthur Adams, Fred Bolman, and to the other members of the panel the Association wishes to express gratitude for this contribution to the profession. To Raymond F. Howes, who, as editor, promptly and efficiently transformed the stenotypist's full report into the present text, special thanks are due. Finally, mention must be made of the faithful, conscientious, and efficient assistance of Miss Anne C. Yates and others on the Association's headquarters staff which is so essential to the behind-the-scenes production of such a volume.

G. Kerry Smith
Executive Secretary
ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Prefatory Note

It is axiomatic—or should be—that a conference is organized to be heard and that a published report is designed to be read. The friendly introductions, repetitive expressions of agreement, and irrelevant anecdotes—not to mention incoherent arrangement of topics—are all inevitable and even attractive features of a protracted oral discussion. They are not desirable features of a printed document.

Hence I have used the stenotype record of the discussion of Group 33 at the Nineteenth National Conference on Higher Education, held by the Association for Higher Education in Chicago, Illinois, on April 21, 1964, merely as raw material. I have pruned, rearranged, revised, and sometimes consolidated: for example, I pulled together all the remarks by the moderator, Arthur S. Adams, condensed them, and put them at the end, because they seemed to make a better conclusion than an introduction.

I hope the readers of this booklet will consider that I have done them a service. And I hope the participants in the conference will forgive me.

R. F. H.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE DISCUSSION

Analyst: FREDERICK deW. BOLMAN, JR., Director of Special Programs, Esso Education Foundation

Panelists: DORIS CROZIER, Assistant to the President, Chatham College

ALGO D. HENDERSON, Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan

DAVID D. HENRY, President, University of Illinois

B. LAMAR JOHNSON, Professor of Higher Education, University of California, Los Angeles

EWALD B. NYQUIST, Deputy Commissioner of Education, University of the State of New York, New York State Education Department

ELLIS L. PHILLIPS, JR., President, Ellis L. Phillips Foundation

WILLIAM J. L. WALLACE, President, West Virginia State College

Moderator: ARTHUR S. ADAMS, President, Salzburg Seminar in American Studies

Recorder: ELLIS F. WHITE, Chairman, Department of Higher Education, New York University

Others: Approximately 250 faculty members and administrators from various colleges and universities

CONTENTS

viii / ix

Foreword ____ iii

Prefatory Note ____ v

Participants in the Discussion ____ vii

Address: "Can We Better Prepare College and University Administrators?" Frederick deW. Bolman, Jr. ____ 1

Discussion, Part I: Comments on Administration and Leadership by Members of the Panel ____ 14

Discussion, Part II: Insights from Organized Programs by Members of the Panel ____ 22

Concluding Statement by Arthur S. Adams ____ 31

Membership of the Association for Higher Education Executive Committee ____ 45

Membership of the AHE Planning Committee for the Nineteenth National Conference on Higher Education ____ 47

Can We Prepare Better College and University Administrators?

Frederick deW. Bolman, Jr.
Director of Special Programs, Esso Education Foundation

Is college and university administration an art, a science—or simply expedient and unpredictable behavior? Strident voices, from Thorstein Veblen to Paul Goodman, have declared that leadership in American higher education has so botched our intellectual direction that amputation of the administration is the only prescription for academic health.

Is there a good way to prepare administrators for their many, varying assignments? Should we continue to draw them from the ranks of recent graduates, the faculty, education, and philanthropic enterprises, without further preparation? Is there a body of knowledge—fundamental insights into sound practice—useful in improving their performance?

The critical questions are what skills are needed by different kinds of administrators and can these skills be acquired more effectively than by doing—or trying to do—the job in question? Some of the relevant skills are specific and technical, and training programs already exist. Prospective collegiate librarians attend a general school of library service. Business managers, accountants, bookstore managers, and the like, have access to undergraduate and graduate disciplines. Certain occupations, such as public relations, housing, purchasing, placement, and fund raising, will at least overlap in character of performance similar activities beyond collegiate walls, and some training facilities are available in these areas.

But many administrative activities in the academic community have no parallel to other forms of work in our society. Where else does one find the equivalent of our registrars, deans of students, admissions officers, directors of alumni relations, directors of off-campus centers, academic deans, the various vice presidents, provosts, presidents, and chancellors?

Address | page 1

The difficult question is: Do we know enough about the skills required of each of the peculiarly academic administrators to be able to say what preparation would be advantageous? Of equal importance is whether there are special insights, vision, and imagination needed by these administrators, and can such abilities be acquired? A different but also critical question is whether there are particular types of personality, interests, and tastes which fit a person for a particular administrative office. And then, finally, there are the basic considerations of whether administration should be a career and, if so, what is the proper or desirable sequence of administrative advancement?

Traditionally, little attention has been paid to questions such as these. The long-standing and unfortunate boundary between faculty and administration has led many to think that only students and professors ever really learn anything and that administrators simply grow accustomed to their work. For a faculty member to declare any personal interest in administration is often a guaranteed way for him to be shunned by his colleagues. The result has been that little heed has been given in the past to what makes a good administrator and whether administrative talents can in any way be nurtured and fortified.

David Riesman and Christopher Jencks note the loss to the improvement of administration because of this gulf between administration and faculty.

> Despite efforts, notably at the Harvard Business School, to give some minimum of training to college administrators after their selection, the administration of higher education has not been professionalized. This reflects partly the envy and resentment that college faculty members, along with other Americans, share against "bureaucrats," but this disdain has not prevented bureaucracy in the perjorative sense, but only professionalization.[1]

Fortunately, the older mystique about administrators is today breaking down, and for understandable reasons. Not only expanding enrollment, but also the rapid increase in the number of institutions, especially at the two-year college level, have created a demand for more and better leaders. Recently, the New York State Board of Regents appointed a special Committee on Educational Leadership to study the problem of qualifications of school and college boards and administrators and to make recommendations of benefit to all institutions in the state.

Moreover, the gradual—but sometimes startlingly rapid—expansion of services rendered by our institutions both on and off campus has created more administrative posts, many of them requiring progressively complex skills. In the period from 1953 to 1959, the U.S. Office of Education reported for the nation a 38.4 percent increase in the resident faculty but a 106.9 percent increase in positions in general administration. The

---

[1]Sanford, Nevitt, editor. "The Viability of the American College." *The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of Higher Learning*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962. p. 101.

swelling of administrative ranks has created a rising demand for qualified persons to fill this new generation of positions. It has also raised the question of just what administrative positions are truly necessary.

Another factor underscoring the need for highly skilled administration is the growing concentration of power in its hands—something which might be called an academic managerial revolution. Our expanding institutions are becoming so complex that governing groups are forced to yield more authority than ever to presidents and restrict board activities to assessing results and determining matters of broad policy. Faculty are prevented from spending much time in governance by increasing off-campus consulting, the rigorous demands for more attention to their expanding fields, ever greater research activity, and increasing professional mobility. Administrators are left to store the mounting data about their institutions, make analyses, develop plans for the future, and initiate and guide action—provided they can gain the needed support of governing boards and faculties. All this is not to say that faculty should not share in the governance of our institutions. I believe they should. But the structure of governance is changing. In all of this, the administration has become, if anything, more important to the success of our institutions than ever before.

During the past quarter century, a number of sponsoring groups—foundations, occupational associations, universities, and an accrediting association—have undertaken some responsibilities for the preparation of administrators. The earliest efforts were directed towards in-service assistance, but lately attention has been paid to preservice preparation as well. A little later we shall examine some of these efforts in greater detail, but here we want to refer to the genesis of preparative devices and the types of sponsorship.

First, in 1939 the Carnegie Corporation began its program of Young Administrators Travel Grants to broaden the perspective of directors of admission, deans of students, academic deans, directors of student employment, assistants to presidents, presidents, and others. From time to time members of full-time teaching faculties were given such semester grants for interinstitutional visitation. The alumni of the program include men who subsequently became deans, provosts, presidents, and chancellors. Preservice programs, some of which we shall discuss later, were sponsored by The Ford Foundation, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, and the Ellis L. Phillips Foundation in the early 1960's.

Since World War II, an increasing number of academic, occupational associations have initiated in-service workshops of varying, though usually short, duration to improve the performance of their members. Thus, for example, since 1949 the Eastern Association of College and University Business Officers has held biennial, three-day workshop clinics dealing mostly with technical matters such as machine accounting techniques, control of utilities, systems and procedures, and the like. Various national and regional associations now have similar workshops for registrars,

public relations officers, campus store managers, student personnel officers of various kinds, directors of admission, housing managers, directors of student unions, development officers, directors of placement, alumni secretaries, directors of adult education programs, deans, and so on. Moreover, annual meetings of many of the professional associations provide insight and techniques to assist the members in serving their institutions.

More recently, a number of graduate schools of education throughout the country have begun to offer programs, for prospective or practicing administrators, leading to the master's and doctor's degrees. Thus, in 1957, with a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, the University of Michigan established its Center for the Study of Higher Education, which provides preparation for those who seek to become presidents, provosts, academic deans, admissions officers, registrars, deans of students, development officers, directors of public relations, alumni secretaries, bursars, controllers, business managers, and the like. Somewhat analogous programs were instituted at the University of California at Berkeley, Stanford, Columbia, Indiana University, Florida State University, and a number of other places. In 1962, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation provided funds for graduate programs to prepare junior college administrators at some leading universities in California, Florida, Michigan, New York State, and Texas.

Other graduate facilities of universities have sponsored more limited, short-term programs for certain professional groups of administrators. Intensive courses of a week or longer have been offered in the summer for business officers at the University of Omaha, the University of Kentucky, the University of California at Berkeley, and elsewhere.

A fourth type of sponsoring group indicating interest in the problem of preparation is the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. In 1957, this regional accrediting group began its Leadership Training Project, to send a select group of young staff members from colleges and universities in the region to visit several different types of institutions during each of three years. The objectives of the program included, but were not limited to, identification of future administrators.[2]

At the present time we clearly have a wide range of separate efforts to improve or to prepare administrators. Those which provide preservice help include such informal devices as apprenticeships, internships, and leadership training. More formal preservice preparation is offered in master's and doctoral programs, and some provision has been made for postdoctoral studies. In-service improvement has in some cases been extensive, as in the program of travel grants and occasional institutional sabbatical programs for administrators. Briefer in-service assistance includes institutes for college and university administrators, workshops for special skills, and a limited number of seminars which deal with research and theory.

[2]Cf. Pfnister, Allan O. "A Regional Accrediting Agency Experiments in the Training of Consultants for Higher Education Institutions." *The Educational Record* 40:62-69. January 1959.

Despite the increasing response to the need for better administrators to meet today's problems in higher education, several weaknesses appear endemic to our efforts thus far.

First of all, lack of coordination. Virtually no thought has been given to coordination of effort among the various sponsoring groups so that the field of administration is covered with something like equal care. Instead, special interests have engendered programs of a variety of intensities, aims, and qualities.

Second, lack of evaluation. Very little systematic evaluation has been made of the extant programs. In other words, how effective the numerous devices really are is largely unknown.

Finally, lack of research. The basis on which all educational efforts must rest, namely, research, has been fragmentary in the case of the various branches of and problems connected with administration. The result has been that we lack anything akin to a growing corpus of knowledge about college and university administration which could be taught.[3,4]

Our problem, whether we *can* prepare better college and university administrators, will depend on whether or not we consider that executive functions in higher education require special skills, comprehension, and insights. While the traditional attitude of faculties aligns administrators with industrial and business managers—"captains of erudition," Veblen scornfully called them—there appears to be a growing conviction that college and university administrators have unique functions to perform and that they perform them best when specially equipped with distinctive academic capabilities. Those who select administrators—a task frequently shared with faculty—want these officers to possess specific backgrounds and attributes which will equip them ably and aggressively to carry forward the educational, research, and service tasks of the institution.

But if we disagree with Sir Hugh Taylor, who once casually remarked that he would just pick a good man and throw him into an administrative job, we must know what competence an administrator should possess and how a potentially good man may be made actually good for his post. Let me hasten to say that I wish to talk in the latter regard more of education in the broad sense than of training. In my opinion administrators in the future will require far more education before tackling a job, and their knowledge should be a growing affair. Once on the job, many will need continuing education, as new theories and techniques are developed.

There appear to be three competences, and, therefore, three kinds of education, required for college and university administrators today.

---

[3]Henderson, Algo D. "Improving Decision-Making Through Research." *Current Issues in Higher Education, 1963.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Association for Higher Education, 1963. pp. 153-156.

[4]McConnell, T. R. "Needed Research in College and University Organization and Administration." *The Study of Academic Administration.* Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963. pp. 113-131.

These are *professional skill, comprehensive understanding,* and what I shall call *political insight* in the Aristotelian sense. Different positions, and the analogous posts in different institutions, doubtless call for varying degrees of sophistication of these competences. But in some measure all those who devote their full time to directing, or helping to direct, the concatenation of academic and institutional events must be able in the areas cited so that faculty and students can achieve their objectives.

To begin with, professional skill is required of all administrators. For some this skill will be relatively homogeneous but highly articulated. Instances of this would be the activities of accounting, finance, library work, and that portion of student personnel work having to do with psychological counseling. Some other posts require homogeneous but simpler skills, as in the case of registrar or recorder, bookstore management, buildings maintenance, or the like. But as one ascends the administrative ladder the skills needed become more heterogeneous and more difficult to define. A dean must certainly possess skillful competence in curriculum matters, in stimulating and assessing scholarly abilities in fields not his own, in handling thorny problems which arise among faculty and in an array of committees, and in directing the work of his staff. And what skills shall we say a president should possess—or are they too many and too various from institution to institution for us to name a single if extensive set?

Graduate schools, usually of education, today offer a number of courses and programs intended to provide some of these skills. Thus at Berkeley, Michigan, and elsewhere the departments of higher education have developed cooperative relations with their schools of business for those who intend to enter the business office of a college or university, so that a person can study standard techniques as well as special financial aspects of colleges and universities. At Columbia and elsewhere, comparable programs exist for those entering the field of psychological testing and counseling. The preparation of librarians, in terms of technical skills, appears today no different for those who will serve an institution than for individuals who will go elsewhere. At Indiana University and elsewhere, courses are offered on curriculum construction. And at Florida State University and other places, more general courses are offered for those preparing for the field of student personnel work.

Different in design is the Institute for College and University Administrators, directed by Professor Robert W. Merry at the Harvard School of Business Administration, and intended for recently appointed deans and presidents or chancellors. The case method has been adapted to a problem-discussion approach for both groups, and each has met separately for about eight days once a year. Two cases are studied in advance for each day of the session, and then a discussant elicits response from the group of approximately forty deans or presidents. The aim of the program is similar to but less intensive than the case method used in the regular two-year business program at Harvard: namely, to develop the

habit of intelligent and responsible decision making. There is, of course, less linkage between cases than in a more intensive program. And there is little attempt to study or discuss theory. Alumni of the various groups which have undertaken the program are enthusiastic, although there is some indication that the deans feel the impact of this skill-training program more vividly and appear to retain greater detail than presidents. On each of several evenings during the sessions visiting lecturers speak on topics of interest to the group as a whole. A unique feature of the entire program, which has been in operation since 1955, is that wives in separate sessions have their own cases for discussion.

Clearly, efforts are already well under way to provide some preservice and in-service education in professional skills. How far we may properly go in calling the skills needed by administrators "professional" is open to question. Yet, to follow the thought of Riesman and Jencks, if most of the skills are not "professionalized," there cannot be preparation, and we may be left with the worst features of bureaucracy.

Administrators are held responsible for continuous, intelligent improvement of specific functions, and this requires a professional attitude towards their work. An increasing number of operations in colleges and universities may require specific preparation; and graduate courses, workshops to which we referred earlier, and institutes may offer hoped-for developments of better skills in the future both through preservice and in-service devices. At least a few institutions involve their faculty or administrative personnel, as for instance in the dean's office or business office, in a kind of apprenticeship program.

The second area of apparent concern over and beyond specific skills is the desire that our administrators, in all capacities, have a better, *comprehensive* understanding of the institutions they serve. Just because the total institution—and particularly from the faculty point of view—is, in John D. Millett's meaning, a community, understanding of the whole is of great necessity for effective work by administrators. Such understanding involves at least three fundamental insights for those preparing to be administrators. First, there is understanding of the administration of a particular type of institution, for example, a junior college. Next, there is the understanding of varying administrative patterns currently used in different institutions. And finally, there is the understanding of the administrative processes themselves.

In the area of the first of these, that of understanding the purpose of the institution, in this country we have greater variety of types of post-secondary schools than in most other countries. And it is also true, as was pointed out by Thomas H. Hamilton: "This amazing institutional variety . . . commonly has provoked either unqualified enthusiasm or astonished horror."[5]

---

[5]Burns, Gerald P., editor. "The Nature and Scope of American Education." *Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962. p. 4.

Tasteful or distasteful, the fact is that our higher educational aims and means are manifold.

A number of graduate school offerings either provide for intensive study of one institutional type or some comparison of different kinds of schools, or both. Thus, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation has helped to provide doctoral programs at ten universities for prospective junior college administrators, and close attention is usually paid to the aims of junior or community colleges. Several universities offer a course under some such title as "Higher Education in the United States," which surveys the purposes, curriculum, organization, finances, and other aspects of different kinds of institutions. While there is much which neophytes can learn on the job about their particular schools, there is value in more comprehensive knowledge of the differing characteristics among their own types of institutions. Traveling fellowship grants to witness variant purposes and performance can and do help provide the kind of understanding to which we refer.

Second, in any comprehensive understanding of the institution must come knowledge of how a given school functions as a whole and the special interrelation of its parts—what Burton R. Clark calls a federation. Columbia University and New York University are both universities with many parallel offerings, yet they function and are federated in quite different ways. Each college or university is so different in these respects that useful generalizations are hard to come by, and graduate courses in higher educational administration can only glance over a few actual patterns.

One method which seems to provide the kind of understanding I am discussing here is the program of internships in academic administration sponsored by the Ellis L. Phillips Foundation. Under this plan, an individual spends his yearlong internship with an appropriate mentor at a host institution viewing the operation of that college or university as well as how his mentor performs his administrative work. Collateral reading, visits to other campuses, and a project for intensive study in some problem confronting the institution are coupled with attendance at various administrative and faculty committee meetings. During the year, the intern comes to have a grasp of how a particular institution functions, and what relationship the parts have to the whole. The values of the experience, besides the test of whether an individual wants to enter the field of administration and whether he is suited to it, include the development of abilities to comprehend an often highly complex institution.

A third aspect of understanding I have called that of the administrative process. There is growing, perhaps all too slowly due to the lack of sufficient research, some knowledge of the general as well as specific academic administrative operations. Most of our literature in the area is biographical or descriptive, and only a relatively small amount involves what can be called theory or conceptual formation. Just as government and industry have found that the study of managerial operations has

improved the performance of their administrators, so colleges and universities may find the same element of benefit. At the University of Michigan, the University of California at Berkeley, and elsewhere, some course work is offered in this field. Similarly, at a recent week-long seminar for administrators, held on the Berkeley campus, and sponsored by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the Center for the Study of Higher Education of the University, the theme was the study of academic administration and included consideration of administrative processes.

Purpose, kind of federation of units, and administrative processes are only three ways by which comprehensive understanding may be acquired. They are important and are receiving increasing attention. But while these provide the broad knowledge of the context in which professional skills should be exercised, they do not of themselves create the attribute of leadership which higher education demands—and will increasingly need.

Leadership requires *political insight*, using politics in the classical sense of the ways and purposes by which men relate themselves to each other, to achieve the good life. Genuine educational leadership or statesmanship as some call it means that a person has an insight into the political, economic, social, ethical, aesthetic, and spiritual forces in society and knows how education may benefit that society. Too frequently, as Harold Dodds has pointed out, the president—and we would include other administrators—is more caretaker than educator. Like Charlie Chaplin in *Modern Times*, administrators have all too often developed reflexive rather than reflective approaches to their tasks and to the total enterprise of higher education. If anything, this trend seems to worsen as our institutions become more complex and the burdens of many offices become more difficult to bear. The only cure will come when the direction and power of education in our society are fully explored and clarified.

If the thought which I expressed earlier, that we have on our hands an academic managerial revolution, has even a grain of truth in it, then the matter of leadership based on political insight has special importance today. It is true that before the turn of the century our administrators were few in number, and we had intellectual giants. Gilman, Eliot, Harper—three names often wistfully recalled—sensed the meanings of their culture and guided the forces of education in intellectually therapeutic ways. Clark Kerr wants us to believe that the day of such giantry is over. But I would argue that he is only partially correct and that it is all the more necessary today for the teams of men and women operating our educational establishments to acquire a kind of cultivation in and sense of direction for our societal problems and possible solutions. Deans of students, directors of development and public relations, admissions officers, librarians, and all of the rest must be bigger than their forerunners. Presidents face bigger jobs, and so do all who work with them in guiding our institutions.

One private university in this country aspires to have every holder of a major administrative post a scholar by inclination and training, for all intents and purposes for the very reason which we have named. A need for dispersed leadership has arisen. Fortunately, as Abraham Flexner pointed out several decades ago, American higher institutions are not governed as their English and German counterparts, and he adds that if they were, "the best minds would stick to the laboratory or the study; inferior persons, executively minded, would probably get control."[6] The majority of presidents selected today have risen through the ranks of faculty and subsequently an administrative position to the office of chief executive. Deans normally come from the scholar's group. So do other types of administrators.

What I wish to stress here is the need for a sound, academic background for each administrator on the campus. Not all offices can or should be filled with working scholars. But an increasingly vital part of the preparation of administrators is the quality and substance of their intellectual insights into our culture, and for this they require sound undergraduate and graduate training.

A demonstration of how keenly this element is felt was the series of "Intellectual Life Conferences," often called the Pugwash Experiment after its first locale, held each year beginning in 1956 and regrettably now discontinued for lack of funds. To these week-long seminars, sponsored by the Association of American Colleges, and provided for through the generosity of the Carnegie Corporation and Cyrus Eaton, came presidents, deans, and occasional faculty to ponder under expert leaders some of the great documents of the Western world—philosophical, historical, scientific, literary, theological. The reason for the seminars was to restore intellectual curiosity, often blunted by the routine pressures of administration. The administrators, most of whom had been at their jobs for some years, were convinced by the end of each seminar that such intellectual revivification was what they sorely needed. In the words of one commentator:

> The Pugwash Experiment was directed toward the solution of a *personal* problem: the problem of the college administrator who, under pressure of practical affairs, has become so divorced from scholarship that he is unable to furnish leadership for a community whose essential business is learning; who cannot see the woods for the trees; who tends to be a hindrance rather than an aid to scholarly activity. The aim was to bring about a changed conception of the administrator's role and an improved atmosphere for scholarship on the American campus.[7]

---

[6]Flexner, Abraham. *Universities, American, English, German.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1930. p. 184.

[7]Wormald, F. L. *The Pugwash Experiment: An Essay in Liberal Education*, Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1958. p. 58.

Clearly we cannot educate or re-educate just anyone for the leadership roles in higher education. To the level of needed acumen can be brought only those with aptness for understanding the meaning of higher education and ability to reformulate our very problems—to ask new questions, as Alfred North Whitehead would say. Unfortunately, the routine of many aspects of administration attracts those who like routine best, and here precisely is a danger. I shall not forget the member of a faculty committee helping to select a president for his university who stressed, among many desired qualities of mind, one which he called "creativity" and which he defined as follows:

> A capacity to be alert to new ways of looking at things from which original ideas and conceptualizations may emerge; some capacity for making inductive leaps, being able to perceive old data in new designs.

Exactly so! And I only add that to some degree this mentality is what is needed at all levels of administration if we are to break through some of our encrusted ways both of thinking and—as Gertrude Stein put it—"doing" education. Creativity appears to many of us as something native and inherent, therefore impossible to instill in a person. But there should be ways found in the future to elicit and encourage such latent abilities.

Professional skills, comprehensive understanding, and political insight, all of which are needed by administrators as verified by several programs set in operation during the last decade or two, will become more important as higher education expands and varies its forms. We cannot afford carelessly to skip the issue of the kind of people who shall direct our institutions and the quality of background they should have. New vigor and new resources are needed for this almost pioneer field of the selection and preparation of college and university administrators.

In conclusion let me suggest that we need in this country a limited number of extraordinarily high caliber university centers for higher education including its administration. We already have a few such centers which stress one or another element I conceive as important. These elements are, first, graduate work on an interdisciplinary basis: second, intensive research into the largely unknown areas of higher educational administration; and third, consultancy and in-service institutes in college and university administration for area institutions.

In 1959, at the 14th Annual National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the Association for Higher Education, what I believe was the first paper to review the nascent field of preparation of college and university administrators was presented.[8] Now, five years later, a great deal more has developed under the stimulus and guidance of institutions, foundations, and occupational associations. Few measures or probes have been introduced to find out if we are doing a better job today, and it would seem to be the time both to consolidate efforts in some new and

---

[8]Wert, Robert J. "What Are the New Developments in the Preparation of College Administrators?" *Current Issues in Higher Education, 1959*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Association for Higher Education, 1959. pp. 221-226.

vigorous ways and to test the values we believe we can impart. I am persuaded that we indeed can educate far better college and university administrators—if we will.

There are several basic questions about administration and preparation which until now have been left unanswered—and I shall quickly state three which appear primary to me.

First, *do we need new kinds of administrative organization?* Perhaps some of the present forms of governance are outmoded and extravagant. New organizations of higher education are developing. For example, the renewed *collegium* division of very large into small undergraduate units at universities may require fresh insight into how each unit may best have autonomy and yet gain benefits from incorporation. Moreover, across the nation we have not yet resolved conflicts among the faculty, administration, and board. Nor have we generally provided administrative positions which challenge the reflective rather than reflexive abilities of administrators. Possibly we fail to attract the best brains and insight into administrative ranks. We have usually merely described and have often been didactic about governance. But we have yet to study intensively how we should govern our institutions of higher learning.

Second, *how shall we find administrative talent?* All extant programs of selection involve little-calculated risks. What we need in personality, interests, and abilities of those who are to perform various executive functions—and I use the term "executive" only to locate specific responsibilities—is woefully lacking. Furthermore, we have thought little about patterns of advancement and of "professionalization," except for academic deans and possibly presidents. Finally, we are thoroughly confused as to who should, in fact, do the selecting of administrators. Stereotypes and political rivalries—among faculty, board, and president—often govern our behavior.

Third, *what is good preparation for entrance into each administrative post?* I have earlier sketched our patchwork approach, and now bemoan the fact we have not yet taken the problem seriously and with the sophistication we purport to use in other areas of organized life. We are at bay as to who should be responsible for preparation—our helter-skelter approach to date indicates interest in the problem but no systematic and cohesive appraisal of the issue of responsibility. We seem paralyzed in the area of coordination of efforts.

In short, *must we remain unscholarly about the direction of scholarship?* Great social forces—population increase, federal investment, vocational needs—are battering at collegiate doors. The time is now at hand for a frontal, persistent, and national attack upon our problems of administration. Sporadic efforts to do something about the matter are insufficient and may prove insignificant. No clear call for solution has come from any quarter.

I see no alternative but to ask that an educational association of the nation's colleges and universities *call to a national conference leaders*

concerned enough to develop a program of joint action. With one and one-half percent of our Gross National Product—and the work of growing thousands of faculty and growing millions of students — being invested annually in colleges and universities, can we afford not to improve the direction of our material and human investment?

Comments on Administration and Leadership

David D. Henry, President, University of Illinois: I take it that the burden of this program and the thesis of Mr. Bolman is that administration at all levels can and should be professional. Accepting this thesis, we should then examine how such professionalization will come about. Mr. Bolman mentioned some specific answers to this question, but there are three premises whose acceptance is necessary before any widespread professionalization is possible.

First, administration is an academic specialization as demanding in scholarship and study as any other discipline. I state this point as a basic condition because if the people who administer and the people who work with administrators don't believe the assertion, then I think there can be no professionalization of administration. Here I am talking about faculties, as well as about administrators.

A second premise is that administration requires a philosophical commitment to the idea of administration, to the worth of the job. A good many of us get weary of the manifestations of the martyrdom complex, or pose perhaps, which suggests that some other kind of discipline is more important, but since somebody has to do this dirty job it might as well be me. The same attitudes are reflected by some presidents who leave their presidencies decrying what impossible jobs they are. Any such low estimate of the importance of the job has no place in administration. In my view administration, *per se*, is important, and it ought to demand the best, and the man who takes it on ought so to believe or he ought not to be on the job.

A third premise is that the administrator must work to understand his job as well as to get it done. He must be sure that he knows the different roles which he must perform, the executive being only one. Planning is another, and interpretation another. Others may be added—and the administrator must know what they are, and the people with whom he

Discussion, Part I | page 14

works must know what they are. Not the least important in understanding his job, is coming to some intuitive or articulated appreciation of the dynamics of group activity—that is, what makes for institutional thrust? How does a university move? What are the fundamental forces at work? Finally, an administrator must have a philosophy of education. He must start with that, for he must see the mission of his institution within a philosophical framework. All of these comments support the point that the administrator, the good administrator, works to understand his job as well as to work at it.

I would not put much stress on skills, techniques, and devices. They will come along, I believe, if these premises are met. I believe that there isn't much point in considering preparation, skills, and devices, and all the other topics related to improving administration until there is a broad professional acceptance, both in the academic-teaching-research world and in the administrative world, as to the validity of these three premises.

One final point—"administration" and "leadership" are ofte- considered synonymous. I believe that leadership is a result, not a p. ess. It is an outcome, not something one consciously programs.

B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education, University of California, Los Angeles: Three emphases seem to me to be important in administration and preparation for administration. First—and I think our speaker this morning put admirable stress on this—is the importance of breadth and depth of scholarship that is required of the college and university administrator.

A second type of emphasis is the essential similarity in tasks faced by administrators in different types of organizations. We are having an increased body of literature which is analyzing the tasks of the administrator, whether he be in a hospital, a business organization, a college or a university. These and the analyses and studies are pointing up quite clearly common elements in all types of administration and the necessity of interdisciplinary work and study as we work on preparation for administration.

A third emphasis was alluded to at several points by Mr. Bolman in his address: Despite the fact that there are similarities, it is important for an administrator preparing to work in a particular type of institution to have experience with the reality of the situation with which he will be confronted. Our speaker referred to this in terms, for example, of the importance of understanding the particular objectives and nature of the organization of which he will be a part. He referred likewise to examples in the preparation of administrators that aim to relate the study and preparation directly to situations to be confronted later. I have in mind, for example, his reference to the use of the case study in the graduate schools of business, in law schools, and in the preparation of college and university administrators. Professor Ellis F. White at New York University and others are exploring the use of the so-called "in-basket" method as a means and an aid to achieving this reality. In addition, a

number of universities are using internships as an aid to the preparation of administrators. Under such a plan, students get actual experience in administration.

William J. L. Wallace, President, West Virginia State College: I think we have assumed that those persons who have the responsibility of selecting college and university presidents are agreed upon the premise that there is need for special education and training for these various positions, but I am not so sure that this is the case. I believe the idea that particularly college and university presidents require certain training must be sold to boards of education and to boards of trustees.

I think that the main factors that have been used, the main criteria, have been first whether or not the prospective college or university president understands the role of the institution of higher education in the community or in the state, and, second, if he has the courage to make proposals which will advance that particular institution. But once the president has been chosen, then it is up to him to choose those administrators with whom he will work, who will form the administrative team, who certainly have specific educational qualifications for the jobs and positions they are to hold.

There is a wide range of administrative positions and up to now we have been talking mainly about the leadership positions of president, vice president, and chancellor, but this wide range of administrative positions involves a great deal of training and educational background. There are some positions in the administrative team which are very routine, and certainly there are specific training courses that will lead to qualification for these various positions—positions in the business office, the registrar's office, and in the office of the dean of students, etc. But beyond that training there is need for the development, even within the minds of those persons who are to deal with routine problems, of a conception of what the institution is all about, and what the role and function of the administrative team is.

To be successful, every member of this administrative team, involving all of the officers of the administration, must have some idea as to the role of that team in the success of the institution, and then the role of the institution in carrying out its purposes and aims as an educational institution. I would call that the logistic support of the educational institution, which is exceedingly important to my mind, and therefore in the education and training of these administrative officers we must take cognizance of this logistic support of the educative processes.

Some faculties are not yet convinced that presidents need special education and training. I think they view this position as one to be filled by a sort of superprofessor, not someone who has an over-all idea as to the functioning of the institution and possesses the qualities to bring about a cooperative approach to the over-all aims of the institution. Therefore, it seems to me, we have not only a proposition to sell to the American public with regard particularly to the presidents and chan-

cellors of universities and colleges, but also the job of selecting and preparing enough of the other members of the team. Our own experience has been that it has been very difficult to find persons at these so-called lower levels of administration to begin this long journey which some people view as being upward, to become a member of the administrative team.

James W. Stevens, Director of Planning, Dartmouth College: I find myself disagreeing with the assumption that one of the prime requisites for effective administration is a scholarly background. My particular position has to do with developing projects in close association with faculty and deans. I have, I think, been able to be effective in this in spite of my not being a scholar. In fact, I think my not being a scholar has been a great help in solving many of the problems I have had to face.

I would submit there are a couple of reasons for this. First, I think the administrative process, as I learned it in the corporate world, is one which is far more participative than is widely realized in the academic world. My own view is that although there are the trappings of participation in decision making by college faculties, all too often this condition is more apparent than real, and needs to be developed.

It seems to me that what the administrator requires is not deep scholarship in any particular field, but a broad understanding and a willingness to delve into a problem to that point at which he knows enough to make a decision; and I think that learning where that point is, is something that my background in industry enabled me to do far better than I would be able to do with a strictly scholarly background. I had to take the consequences of my decisions, against the background of a performance budget that is not now commonly accepted in higher education.

I am quite clear, also, that we need to realize that a college is a rather complex institution requiring the same kinds of skills of management that are also needed in the corporate world. Here again, you cannot be expert in every phase of corporate activity, but you have to gain the ability to find out what you must know in order to arrive at a decision and carry out a particular program, and also the ability to go in and sell your solution to people above. I think our colleges would be much strengthened by more of an infusion of people with these kinds of skills and backgrounds. I think we should not only try to train people through a Ph.D. program—I am not altogether clear this is the way to train an administrator—but we should also try to bring in people with administrative skills to back up the men who are our leaders, not only because they are scholars but also because they are fine men.

Frederick Bolman: This matter of the scholarly background is a tremendously important one, and I think it is one in which we run on hunches, prejudices, rationalization, etc. There is, of course, the union card attitude. This is rationalized in terms of the person who is in an executive position of one sort or another having a kind of understanding of the enterprise with which he is connected. One of the men with whom

I talked in my research, who was chairman of a selection committee of the faculty to find a new president, was a psychiatrist, and he put it rather nicely. He said he hoped the new man would have a genuinely parental attitude, because he would have to gain his satisfaction vicariously from the triumphs of others. The rationalization, then, of the union card, it seems to me, would be perhaps that he can gain this vicarious satisfaction only from the successes and triumphs of others if he has come up through the academic ranks.

On the other hand, in the course of my work, I had to look a good deal into the selection process and the various criteria and the decision-making apparatus used in industry, in government, in the armed services, and in the public schools. One man would agree with you very wholeheartedly. He has much weight on his side and many facts, and I do not. John K. Hemphill, who directed the Executive Study for the Educational Testing Services in Princeton, believes that the qualities which make for executive activity in its proper sphere do not require this kind of academic background; that indeed those who have the academic background, I think he would add, may ofttimes be narrowed in their specialization and have difficulty overcoming that narrowness; that those who do not have it will be selected and should be primarily because they have the kind of decision-making abilities which have nothing to do with a scholarly background.

So you point up a very lively and much debated issue here. Let me say, however, our culture runs deep in this respect: for example, of 116 recently selected college presidents, eighty-three percent held the earned doctor's degree; another eleven percent had the bachelor of divinity degree, which is a graduate degree usually requiring three years; and two percent held only a bachelor's degree, although occasionally they acquired an honorary doctor's degree or two. In other words, the tradition, at least for the chief executive officer, is that he come from the scholarly ranks.

My investigation of the presidents themselves—this sample of 116 —was that they were not top-flight scholars on the average. Only about twenty-seven percent of them had ever received a research grant either from the National Science Foundation or a private foundation. Again, only about twenty-five percent belonged to any of the three classified honorary undergraduate societies.

So it does seem to me we are looking for something here that identifies a person. We have talked about devotion to higher learning and its institutionalization, and perhaps we use the degrees and the partial or half-baked scholarship as a kind of touchstone as to whom we may select from. They form a pool or reservoir. Indeed, we are charged by industry and other forms of organized life in our society with not training our own. We have had a rough system of training in the past: namely, that you get your final degree, based in part upon research; that you enter the lists in teaching; that you rise through the lists; that you then

assume part- or full-time administrative activity; and that you may then indeed be in a huge bull pen from which college presidents are selected.

I am unwilling, without further evidence from John Hemphill and others, to give up this idea. I find that while there may be a degree of narrowness, there is an index to devotion, an index to personal sacrifice, an index of understanding as to what institutionalized higher learning means.

Ellis F. White, Chairman, Department of Higher Education, New York University: In addition to my more scholarly efforts, I work with an executive search firm, and I help to select people who will be executives in industry. I am struck with the logic of the gentleman from Dartmouth who says that although he has been in industry he finds it possible to be comfortable in a different setting. I think there are some things we haven't discovered yet. Who is it that can be a physicist and equally at home in a corporation and in a university? I am sure there are some people who can. Louis T. Rader, President of Univac Division of Sperry-Rand Corporation, would be a very competent university president. I can think of some university presidents who can make the transition from university to industry—Carroll V. Newsom would be a good example of that—and they are very capable.

If you would ask me what it is I look for when I look for an executive, it wouldn't make any difference whether I was looking for an executive for higher education, or a corporation, or some other organization, I would look for a person who can conceptualize—this has to do with this high degree of ability to keep ten balls in the air at the same time and not drop any of them. Technical competence is the second factor I would look for. The executive must know the field in which he is operating. You can't take an engineer, obviously, and put him in charge of a law firm. It would be just as difficult to take a lawyer and put him in charge of a group of engineers. The third factor I would look for is the ability to work with a team, the ability to fathom what it is that causes problems among people. We could get along fine in institutions if it weren't for people, for they get in the way of decisions. A good administrator needs to possess a knowledge of interpersonal sensitivity and must be capable of using this information.

By and large, I think most executive searchers would tell you these are the three major characteristics they look for, and I hold it is only tradition that keeps us emphasizing the need for the doctorate for administrative posts.

Algo D. Henderson, Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan: I think I am the last one to suggest it is necessary to go through a formalized program and earn a doctor's degree before you can become a college administrator. The fact of the matter is, eighty percent or more of the persons who get into certain parts of administration, as Mr. Bolman said, do have it. The man under whom I got my initial experience as a college administrator had never gone

to college. I am referring to Arthur Morgan of Antioch College, who founded the very dynamic program that has been there ever since he launched it. I would suspect it is still a highly successful program.

We use this term "scholarly" in many ways, of course. I use it in terms of intellectual quality of a person—the person who is really able to perform at the level of higher education.

From another viewpoint, there are certain focuses you can think of. There is the narrow focus of a staff or lesser line position, where the job is essentially that of gaining information, making analyses, coming to a decision, and implementing, but some of us, in talking about this kind of program, are talking about the person who eventually will be in a top-level position of leadership as well as of administration.

I recall one meeting Harlan H. Hatcher, president of the University of Michigan, had with the directors and presidents of foreign universities who came to observe our program. He was trying to convey to them his impression of his main functions, and one of the things he emphasized was that he thought he was the symbol of the University. This is something quite apart from just sheer management. If he is going to be the symbol of a great university, then he must be generally recognized as a scholar. One may think of some other of the higher level officials who are in less need of this.

We commonly think of the area of business administration as requiring less. Certainly there is not much point in putting a Ph.D. in geology in charge of the business operation of the university, unless he really has some good financial and business sense, but I would contend that the business manager, thinking of the higher officials of today, rather than being purely service administrators carrying through certain functions—budgetary and otherwise—by reason of being identified now as vice presidents of the university or college, and by reason of the Monday morning weekly breakfast with the president, is getting very actively into the top decision-making group and engaging in the decision-making process. And regardless of what you say about the process, the fact is that at these Monday morning breakfast meetings a good share of the policy decisions of the universities are actually made, perhaps subject to communicating the idea to the faculty or trustees, but actually formulated.

If men of the type who formerly have been essentially service officers are going to be in this high decision-making position, they are going to need more education than they have had in the past. It will not be sufficient to be trained merely as a business manager, or as an accountant, or as a controller, but rather they must have something of the broad perspective, because they are helping the president, the academic dean, and often several other vice presidents, to formulate this high-level policy which in the end determines what the character of the institution is going to be.

Frederick Bolman: May I touch briefly on another point? The first time I was a president of a community college I had all kinds of problems rampant, and I had a wonderful local board, a wonderful faculty, etc., but there were many, many problems I couldn't talk about. I remember running over to Carroll Newsom in Albany with a real problem, and he looked at me and said, "Now you are discovering that administration is the loneliest job in the world."

This is, in part, true. There are times when you cannot discuss with anybody on your campus, even a board member, certain issues that are problematic and on which you need counsel, etc. One of the presidents I studied this year had in the course of his three-year tenancy, with one exception, a brand-new board. He said to me, "I have nobody to hold my hand," and that is quite true.

Channels now exist, in both regional and national association meetings, for presidents, deans, admissions officers, and the like to have enlightened professional conversation. Very frequently the dean, or president, or anyone else among administrators will go home from these meetings overjoyed with the knowledge he isn't the only one who has problems to bear.

Eugene Heide, Director, New Kensington Center, The Pennsylvania State University: I was interested in your comment because about two months ago our university held a meeting of all administrative people, from the president and vice presidents on down through the department head level. It is interesting how much you can find out from talking with these people as department heads and deans, etc., and how much commonality there is in this administrative clique. It was also interesting that the secretaries then running the University had the best three days that Penn State ever experienced.

Insights from Organized Programs

Ewald B. Nyquist, Deputy Commissioner of Education, University of the State of New York: As was mentioned by the speaker in his fine address, the Board of Regents, which is the constitutional head of our educational system in New York State, running the entire gamut of education, both public and private, appointed last fall a committee on educational leadership. I'd like to read its purpose: "How can persons with leadership potential be identified, trained, and selected for executive positions in education at all levels and for membership on lay boards of control in all types of formal educational systems and institutions?" This project is going to run for about two or three years. We received a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of two hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Perkins, the new president of Cornell, is the chairman, and the committee is a distinguished group of both lay people and educators.

We have addressed ourselves to leadership in the superintendencies of schools, boards of education, boards of trustees of higher institutions, and college presidencies, and then to the state-wide barriers to educational leadership. We have some fine frenzies about education in the State of New York. We have just begun. We have addressed our program to New York, hoping that the results will be translatable to other states, but maybe they won't be.

We have come to believe that there is a new nature of educational leadership. There is almost a calculated interdependence among all sorts of elements. In large communities, an institution does not work in splendid isolation. School and college education has changed tremendously in the last few decades. There is need for an examination of the new nature of educational leadership to see that it is widely understood by educational leaders themselves and by their boards of governors. The day of the individual leader who could manage an institution or a

Discussion, Part II | page 22

school system largely by himself is over, at least in such large complexes as today's large school systems, large colleges, and certainly multiversities. The chief executive of any of these organizations must be a team leader, must be able to work with other administrators in his organization, many of whom are highly specialized. Nevertheless, he is the individual head man.

This new concept of educational leadership does not minimize the role of the leader, since he does have ultimate responsibility. It emphasizes, rather, the interrelationships of various forces.

Our first committee meeting is what I am drawing from. We dwelt a little while on evaluation. How do you know how well you are doing? How do you tell how well a leader or leadership team handles important responsibilities? How can effective educational leadership be evaluated? Here are some things we have considered: (1) possession and clear understanding of goals; (2) the effectiveness of working interrelationships with board members, and the reason for the effectiveness; (3) the chief executive officer's ability to pick good subordinates. I would place this third item very high. A poor college president can float on top if he knows how to pick good subordinates. These were suggested as three major criteria. Others discussed included the possession of an intellectual style, creativeness, and the ability to anticipate change.

One of our people asked: What distinguishes educational leadership from other kinds of leadership? I think this is another large arena for discovery, and some suggested qualities belonging together include high native intellect, the ability to work hard and long, and a social consciousness.

I'd like to throw out one other point. No college president chooses himself. He develops his own aspirations, of course, but all the leaders in our system of society are chosen by predominately lay boards of governors. This goes for a superintendent of schools or for a college president. You can make a better case for assigning high priority to improving the identification, selection, and orientation of members of boards of governors, because they are the ones who are going to choose the college and university presidents in the first place.

Ellis L. Phillips, Jr., President, Ellis L. Phillips Foundation: We have three ladies and ten men who are serving this year as Phillips Foundation interns in various colleges and universities all over the country in a very wide geographical area and different types of universities, and these people are supercharged now with ideas. They have been observing firsthand the problems we have been discussing somewhat in the abstract. At a recent meeting, we asked them if they had detected a sense of frustration, a sense of being overwhelmed with problems, a sense of administrative malaise in the places they have been to, or if everything is placid and calm in the other pools around the country. We got a very quick reaction that the situation is not calm and easy anywhere.

Then the question was: What can we do about it? Here are a few points I recall.

One is that there is no single pattern of administrative procedure that does exist and probably can exist, and, therefore, you can't really study this subject as a subject in and of itself. It is something which has to be studied in context, and, of course, this is what the interns have been doing.

Then we talked about the analogies to business. It is clear there are analogies. There are also, of course, differences, with which we are very familiar.

One thing we talked about specifically was Mr. Sloan's book and the value of a table of organization, and I think we concluded that the table of organization is a very worthwhile thing to have, but it is helpful only in its planning, its preparation. Once it has been prepared, it is out of date and is no good to anybody.

Then we talked about the administrative team and the need for that kind of a concept, and its role. Is the role of the administrator one simply of presiding over a committee—or just what? I think we agreed that the role is to provide leadership and actually to direct and run institutions if they are going to move ahead, if they are going to succeed, if they are going to measure up to their capacity. But how this is going to be done—the technique of doing it—cannot be defined in any one formula, and, in fact, does vary in patterns across the land and will continue to vary. As one of our men put it, there are various syndromes in which we all tend to exist, and we must face up to that fact.

We also concluded that if an administrator at whatever level was to be part of a leadership team, this would require a capacity of standing apart, of being able to get ahead of his problems. Everywhere the interns observed there were so many day-to-day problems that came across the desks of the people they were working with, trifling perhaps in part but overwhelming in aggregate, that there was a sense of never quite getting ahead, never quite understanding what you really were about; and I think we agreed that this was absolutely necessary. How this is to be done, how people provide the time for this to be done, is a problem that each group will have to work out, but it is clear that it is necessary.

Finally, we talked a little bit about curricular things. Is the traditional departmental structure to continue as the basis, or is interdisciplinary work to become the pattern in the future? There were various opinions on this, but no clear conclusion.

We started this program to identify and to select administrators in 1961. We haven't waited to study the problem. We tried to seek out and to identify, through those we know and respect in the field, people who probably are not now in administration but who might have an interest. They don't have to have a commitment; that could come later. We think the great need is to add to the pool of really able and potentially great administrators. We need more people. We need more good people.

There aren't nearly enough of them around. There aren't nearly enough who have been given some kind of identification with the role of administrator. Whether they go back to teaching, or go back to business, or to industry is of no concern, once they have been given this vision of what education can do in the United States.

Doris Crozier: I guess I'm a living exponent of the various expedients that have been suggested here, having sat under Mr. White in his class on policies in higher education and having had the great experience of being an Ellis Phillips Foundation intern this year.

I see internship as answering very well three separate needs that have been brought up in the previous discussion.

First, Mr. Henry talked about the belief among many people who are in administrative positions that they have to imply they would rather be back in the classroom; that you cannot really identify yourself as interested in administration or this lessens you a little bit in the eyes of your colleagues. If you decide to be an intern, you have clearly indicated an interest in administration, you have stated your position, so to speak, and you don't feel the necessity of defending it.

The second point, which Mr. Bolman brought out, is the necessity for the comprehensive view of an institution, no matter how large or how small. Any one of us interns can say that we, coming in as strangers, being exposed to the various aspects of the institutions where we were, were really privileged to be able to acquire this comprehensive view. We had no vested interest in any particular part of the college or university, and we were able to view its workings much more dispassionately than anybody else.

Thirdly, we have had a year to look at our own careers, a year to read all the books we've been meaning to read and never got around to, a year to be what Mr. Bolman describes as a reflective instead of a reflexive person, and although the results of this year will not be known immediately, the impact will be one that will be very great on us as individuals. We would hope that it would also be great on the field of higher education.

Lamar Johnson: I should like to report briefly on programs designed to increase the supply of junior college administrators. A recent study indicated the numbers that will be required within the next twelve years. We are having twenty-five to thirty new two-year colleges established annually, and within the next twelve years it is estimated conservatively that we will need 1,000 new chief administrators for junior colleges, and this will be multiplied if we think of deans and subadministrators. Therefore, we must keep before us the matter of quantity as we also strive and must strive for quality.

I think there are two facets in this situation which led the Kellogg Foundation to become interested in making grants to ten universities to develop programs for the preparation of junior college administrators.

On the one hand, the Foundation was greatly concerned with this matter of quantity and quality; and, second, the Foundation was concerned with the point our speaker made: the importance of understanding the particular institution the person is preparing to administer, because, typically, our junior colleges have been borrowing their administrators from colleges and universities. The Foundation made grants for a period of four years, which have recently been renewed for a period of three additional years.

Each of the projects has an advance doctoral program preparing graduate students for administration in junior college. I would say they vary somewhat, but are very much in the spirit of Mr. Bolman's presentation. Our internship plan at the University of California at Los Angeles is a bit different from the type that has been reported here. An advanced graduate student is employed part time (usually half time) and is paid by the junior college where he is working. Some students are on rotating internships, to borrow a term from medicine; others are on more specialized internships. All are learners engaging in work that is useful to a junior college and, at the same time, are getting administrative experience and coordinating it with advanced studies.

A second feature of the programs with which the Kellogg Foundation is assisting consists of in-service education, conferences, workshops, and the like. One of the more important aspects of in-service education emerges from the advisory relationships that some of the programs have developed with the chief administrators of junior colleges. These administrators have an active role in planning and developing important features of the program.

Third, I would say the matter of relationships is one that is being emphasized in these programs—relationships between university faculties and the administrators of junior colleges, as I have just suggested—and also interdisciplinary relationships, bringing together the resources of total universities and focusing on administration, the preparation of administrators, and in particular the preparation of administrators for a specific type of institution.

Algo Henderson: In connection with the art of administration, I think there is less we can do in a program such as we have at the University of Michigan than in the case of science, because art has so much to do with personal qualifications and with experience. This leads me to comment on this subject of identification. I believe it is tremendously important for those of us working in the universities to do the best possible job of identifying the most able persons to go into this field, identifying them at least in two respects—one, as having very high potential for administration, essentially group leadership and the like; and the other, high quality in their ability to undertake academic work.

Unless we give attention to these two things, I think there is a danger that this mushrooming movement will give doctors' degrees to a large number of persons who, by reason of lack of fitness for administration

and lack of sufficiently high intellectual and other qualities, will fail because of inability really to administer or because of lack of acceptance by their peers. I'd like to say that quite seriously. I think this is a mushrooming movement, and there is grave danger that we may kill the movement before it gets well under way by being insufficiently selective of the young people that we accept for the programs.

With respect to the science aspect of it, Mr. Bolman spoke of certain understandings that are needed. I would suggest these are essentially two, and the first is the academic one. We get this in better perspective if we think not merely of administrators in the abstract or administrators of teachers colleges or liberal arts colleges, but of engineering schools, or medical schools, or law schools. In our program we have now had several engineers and we are getting our first man from law this next year. We have one this year from agriculture. It is inconceivable, is it not, to assume that we could prepare a man in professional education who would be acceptable and carry through as the academic dean of a school of law, or a school of medicine, or a school of engineering? I submit that much the same thing is true of any other kind of school, such as the liberal arts college. There should be some substantial background in the academic area to provide an understanding of the curriculum, the teaching, and the goals of this particular kind of institution, and in addition to get the peer acceptance, acceptance for leadership purposes in these areas.

The second point has to do with an understanding of the theory relating to the field if we think of this field as a new discipline. I am quite convinced that we must develop an academic discipline here, one based upon theory, one based upon research, one based upon historical perception, if we are really going to proceed.

Here one could subdivide in many ways, but I would suggest the history and philosophy of higher education, the history of great universities, as a respectable subject into which to delve. I don't know why the history of higher education has been as much neglected as a respectable aspect of history as it has, because I think maybe it is of as great importance to study as the history of a war or a particular political period. So in any faculty that is being organized it would seem to me essential to have a genuine scholar in the area of philosophy and history, who can devote himself to the study of the history and philosophy of higher education. To mention another illustration, I would refer to the theory of organization, of administrative behavior, administrative processes, the whole subject of decision making.

Much of our philosophy of administration, and it is certainly true of universities as well as of other kinds of organizations, stems originally from the autocratic idea, concepts handed down by reason of the prerogatives given to the king—his ability to command, and order, and expect obedience. Now, my background happens to be in business administration; so I am quite aware of the great impact made by

Frederick W. Taylor and others in studying the subject of business administration when they introduced the concept of time and motion studies as a means of gaining greater efficiency in connection with management. You may recall that for a rather considerable period of time American industry and indeed other forms of organization were highly motivated by this new discovery in connection with administration.

Unfortunately, the idea of efficiency of management carries over more than it should. We are being pressed today in the colleges and universities to show efficiency where effectiveness is much more important than efficiency. But the scarcity of the dollar is forcing us to re-examine ourselves in this respect, and it is true that many areas of administration, the janitoring of a room for example, can be put on a time and motion and efficiency basis. But presently, in the area of business administration, this development was carried to the point where there was a reaction from labor. Labor thought there were other values in addition to just getting a job done in a minimum of time and going on to something else.

Robert Merry, working in the Harvard Business School of Administration, developed some new concepts of administrative behavior, and numerous other social scientists came along from the whole behavioral science group, examining group participation as a new theory of organization and administration. And here is a theory that would seem, more than any other you might think of among those known today, as being applicable to college and university administration, because of the traditional feeling of faculty that they are peers of the administrators and should participate. The theory advanced by these behavioral scientists was that actually you get better productivity by reason of understanding and participation, and more recent writers have been emphasizing the college as a community and the necessity of applying a group participative kind of theory in relation to the organization and the manner of behavior. So administrators find working at the policy program level with adequate organizations to which to delegate authority is almost a necessity today in light of the tremendous expansion of the size and complexity of our institutions.

I hope I have illustrated sufficiently to suggest that there is a content here, a body of theory that relates to the practice, which can be drawn from psychology, sociology, political science, public administration, business administration, etc., in every field where much greater research has been done than in higher education, which can be drawn together to form a group of seminars that delve into theory, organization, administrative behavior, administrative processes, etc., applied to colleges and universities.

This suggests the value of the genuine graduate program or postgraduate program that is associated with basic research, because it is the research, following upon the groundwork that has been done in these various other areas of administration, applied to colleges and universi-

ties, that nourishes these programs, these courses, these seminars, the dissertations of the students in this area.

Let me reiterate that if we proceed on the assumption that we have here an academic discipline that does have content, and offer these kinds of studies of which I have given two illustrations, a broad, historical, philosophical background and a basic study of organization and administration, coupled with substantial research, you begin to get an important program.

Let me relate back to my apprehension. In addition to failure to identify sufficiently the character and quality of the people coming into programs of this kind—and I think, instead of just yielding to the demand for people, that we should stem the tide and try to encourage a flow of demand from other quarters—we should see to it that the persons that go in here have substantial potentiality for administration.

Secondly, in this mushrooming of institutions and of courses, we must be very careful that when we give lip service to interdisciplinary courses and curriculum and seminars, etc., we really mean it and not end up with merely a few additional courses in professional education: for example, drawing heavily upon secondary education, administration, and the like, to fill out for the benefit of these students.

It might interest you to know that among the nine faculty members we have on our teaching staff now, we have men who have backgrounds in engineering, in law, and in business administration, Ph.D's in psychology and political science, as well as two or three men who have doctors' degrees in the area of professional education. Through research, through getting these background materials, through selection of faculty, we make the program essentially interdisciplinary, but identify it, just as we do public administration or business administration, as a respectable academic field of study.

Member, University of Delaware: Some speakers have observed the importance of durability in the administrator, while others have noted the problem of the administrator is that of distinguishing between the urgent and important and trying to keep away from being a paper shuffler. We have noted various kinds of pressures and problems. Mr. Bolman suggests that administrators frequently don't get included in sabbatical programs or get to take their vacations. I wonder if anything could be said about the training, or selection, or perhaps the organization of administration that would help toward self-renewal—the opportunity for regaining perspective and detachment; if anything could be done in this direction to preserve the necessary qualities you have been describing.

Frederick Bolman: The Pugwash Experiment I mentioned in my paper was an experiment along that line. Regrettably it was not continued. Of course, it was a very limited affair, with very few people involved. I am aware of the fact that at least one, and possibly more, institutions have publicly declared sabbatical leave programs for administration.

It is tremendously important to unwind your administrator who has become tight as a Yo-yo; not only to unwind him, but to let him redevelop intellectually. We have studied very little about what to do with people, however, during that period.

The one institution I know of that has announced a program for sabbatical leave for administrators will give them the typical half-year leave full pay, full-year half pay, but it will only do it if the individual has a commendable program of study. Obviously this is not graduate work, but rather something that will help rejuvenate him and help him to have a broader perspective of his work, and to give truthfully a forward thrust to institutional life.

Regrettably I think we have been very shortsighted in this area. We defend very stoutly a sabbatical program for faculty, but nowadays seven years is too infrequent in many areas, and perhaps in all. We are now introducing a four-year cycle, particularly in the small college, where a faculty member loses touch with his field and is having a thinning group of colleagues with whom to talk, etc. How we are to do that in administration, I don't know.

Algo Henderson: I share your feeling that there is a need of a sabbatical program for administrators. As a part of our Center for the Study of Higher Education, we have had a postdoctoral program, for the most part under fellowships offered by one of the large foundations. It is on the theory that, after all, perhaps the best future administrator of the highest potential is the man who has gotten some start in administration, thus having been identified by his own faculty as having the potential and having had some initial experience in it; he may then benefit by a more formal opportunity to study and perhaps have internship experiences. With the thought that the Foundation money might run out in the course of time, we have begun some effort to persuade colleges and universities to place persons whom they would like to have participate in this program on sabbatical leave. I made a personal appeal to about 150 selected presidents of colleges and universities during each of the past two years to help us identify individuals from their administrative staffs, with the expectation that the institution would invest some resources in that individual by granting him sabbatical leave to take part in the program. We offered to supplement the amount. We have had in the program this year eight postdoctoral men, and out of that eight, five have had some kind of sabbatical grants from their home institutions.

Concluding Statement

Arthur S. Adams, President, Salzburg Seminar in American Studies

The size of the group attending the sessions and participating in the discussion signifies recognition of the very great importance that needs to be attached to administration in higher education in our country. The admirable address by Mr. Bolman, the comments of the panelists, and the remarks by others in the group opened up, at least, consideration of a number of vital issues raised in advance by members of the Association for Higher Education. Among these were the following:

What should be the proper curriculum for preparation of college and university administrators?

To what extent can internships be utilized in the preparation of college and university administrators?

In what important ways can theory and practice be bridged in classroom preparation of administrators?

What kind of background best prepares a person for effective leadership in college administration?

Despite the warning of President David D. Henry not to overestimate the importance of skills, there appeared to be general agreement that conscious attention should be given to the preparation of college and university administrators. We heard descriptions of a number of organized efforts in that direction.

The issue discussed at greatest length was whether or not academic administrators need to have a scholarly background. The judgment of the group was that there should be in senior administrative posts a number of people with scholarly background, but that such a background is not by any means essential for everyone in administration. University administration has become so complex as institutions have grown that need has arisen for numerous kinds of specialists, particularly in the general area of business and finance.

I can remember in my own history that I was at once about five different officers, as we call them today, but life was simpler then. The same institution needs five officers today for what one man did before. These functions have now been clearly defined, and each requires full attention from a qualified person.

The forces of change are still at work. I am sure they will continue to cause changes of functioning in colleges and universities. Whatever we may plan now should not be designed as a mold for the future, but should be so based in principle that it can be adapted to situations as they arise.

As I review the discussion of the group, I feel impelled to add three items of my own that seem to me not to have been mentioned with due emphasis.

In the first place, I would speak to the joys of administration. This, of course, is related to what Mr. Henry said about not downgrading the importance of the job nor one's commitment to it. But there is joy in administration, the inner satisfaction one can derive from the resolution of problems that are really difficult. That joy, I can testify, is very great indeed. It is kind of a secret joy, but nevertheless it is immensely satisfying.

The second point I would mention has to do with the necessity for the administrator to be interested in people. He must have a concern for people, and he must look upon people as being worthy exponents of the positions they take, even when those positions are unusually strange. He must have an unusually great ability to dissociate the problem from the person raising it, so that he can have a real feeling of interest, even an affection for the person at the same time he is differing with that person.

The third point I would raise is the necessity for an administrator—and I am trying to follow the rules of rhetoric and grammar by placing it at the last of my three points because I wish to give it the greatest emphasis—to possess durability, because the load of the administrator is one which calls for unremitting attention. He must be durable; he mustn't be easily thrown off course; he must know how to take it as well as to dish it out.

So these would be three points I would venture to add to our discussion —the joys of administration, the liking for people, and durability.

Looking again to the future, one of the suggestions made by Mr. Bolman and received with favor by the group was that a national educational organization should convene a national conference to discuss the variety of efforts being made more effectively to prepare college and university administrators, and to deal with some of the issues discussed at this meeting. Such a conference, hopefully, would continue to reach forward to solutions of problems and would also ensure more complete and balanced coverage of the field, to the end that there may be an over-all coordinated effort rather than the separate, sporadic efforts to which people give greatly of their time and energy, not to mention

their money, in an endeavor to meet a problem which is deeply sensed but not completely identified. There was general agreement that such a conference would be useful.

Whether or not this particular type of conference is held, I am confident that further attention will be given to the preparation of college and university administrators, for the simple reason that it will have to be. We cannot assume that people are simply going to be picked up here and there by the helter-skelter methods we have had in many instances to date, to deal with problems of the magnitude now clearly visible on the horizon.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1963-1964

President

H. T. Morse, Dean
The General College
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Vice President

William H. Conley, President
Sacred Heart University
Bridgeport, Connecticut

Members

C. R. Carpenter, Executive Director
The Survey Committee
Milton S. Hershey Medical Center
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Ruth E. Eckert
Professor of Higher Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

E. K. Fretwell, Jr.
Assistant Commissioner for
Higher Education
State Education Department
Albany, New York

Leland L. Medsker, Vice Chairman
Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

Kate Hevner Mueller
Professor of Higher Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Seymour A. Smith, President
Stephens College
Columbia, Missouri

Judson C. Ward, Jr.
Vice President and Dean of Faculties
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

William R. Wood, President
University of Alaska
College, Alaska

Lloyd S. Woodburne
Professor of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

MEMBERSHIP OF THE AHE PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR THE NINETEENTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

1964

Chairman

W. Max Wise, Associate Director
The Danforth Foundation
St. Louis, Missouri

Members

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., President
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

Robert J. Blakely, Dean
Extension Division
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Harold L. Hodgkinson, Dean
Bard College
Annandale-on-Hudson, New York

Jerome H. Holland, President
Hampton Institute
Hampton, Virginia

Robert J. Keller
Professor and Director
University High School
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Frank L. Kidner
University Dean
Educational Relations
University of California
Berkeley, California

Sister M. Jacqueline, S.L.
Vice President
Webster College
Webster Groves, Missouri

James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Division of Community Junior Colleges
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida